

REMARKS

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 9, 11-13, 19, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,098,064 (Pirolli) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,600,316 (Moll). Applicants agree with the Examiner that Pirolli does not disclose or suggest determining redundancy of prefetch data. According to the Office Action, Moll discloses determining redundancy of prefetch data, and therefore, can allegedly be combined with Pirolli to form the subject matter of claims 1, 11, and 23. However, Applicants respectfully note that Pirolli, rather than identifying redundancy of prefetch data, specifically teaches addressing insufficient space in local cache by transferring prefetch data that have low probabilities of being requested to a server, while keeping prefetch data that have high probabilities of being requested in a local cache (column 2, line 62 to column 3, line 30). Because Pirolli specifically requires a different technique from that taught in Moll to address the same problem, Pirolli clearly teaches away from Moll, and therefore, cannot be combined with Moll to form the subject matter of claims 1, 11, and 23. For at least the foregoing reason, claims 1, 11, and 23, and their respective dependent claims, are believed allowable over Pirolli, Moll, and their combination.

Claims 1-3, 9, 11-13, 19, and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,822,749 (Agarwal) in view of Moll. Applicants agree with the Examiner that Agarwal does not disclose or suggest determining redundancy of prefetch data. According to the Office Action, Moll discloses determining redundancy of prefetch data, and therefore, can allegedly be combined with Agarwal to form the subject matter of claims 1, 11, and 23. However, Applicants respectfully note that Agarwal specifically teaches addressing insufficient space in local cache by prefetching information having a size that matches a request (column 3, lines 35-40). Because Agarwal requires a different method from that taught in Moll to address the same problem, Agarwal teaches away from Moll, and therefore, cannot be combined with Moll to form the subject matter of claims 1, 11, and 23. For at least the foregoing reason, claims 1, 11, and 23, and their respective dependent claims, are believed allowable over Agarwal, Moll, and their combination.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all remaining claims are believed in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this amendment, please contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-2518, referencing billing number 7011022001. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-2518, referencing billing number 7011022001.

Respectfully submitted,
Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: August 8, 2005

By: 
Gerald Chan
Reg. No. 51,541

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (650) 849-4960
Facsimile: (650) 849-4800